1656 VETOES

In a State in which the people take pride in local government and local sovereignty, and where home rule is strongly advocated, I am convinced that it would be a backward step for us to add new limitations to the direct powers by which Counties and Municipalities conduct their own affairs.

For the reasons stated above, I am disapproving Senate Bill No. 58.

## Sincerely,

(s) THEODORE R. McKeldin,

Governor.

TRMcK:O/c

## Senate Bill No. 64-Motor Vehicle Registration Fee\*

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Sections 172 (a), 172 (f) and 174 of Article 56 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1956 Supplement), title "Licenses", sub-title "Public Passenger and Freight Motor Vehicles"; to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 24 of Article 66½ of said Supplement, title "Motor Vehicles", sub-title "Administration—Registration—Titling"; to repeal both versions of Section 80 in said Article 66½ (1951 Edition and 1956 Supplement), and to enact a new Section 80 in lieu thereof, to stand in the place of the section so repealed, and to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Sections 269 and 271 of Article 81 of said Supplement, title "Revenue and Taxes", sub-title "Mileage Tax for Use and Maintenance of Roads", repealing the increases in certain taxes, permit and registration fees for motor vehicles as said increases in rates and amounts were enacted and provided for in Chapter 657 of the Acts of 1953; correcting an error in said Section 172 (a); repealing an obsolete provision concerning certain refunds in Prince George's County; and relating generally to certain taxes and permit and registration fees for motor vehicles in this State.

February 26, 1957.

Honorable Louis L. Goldstein President of the Senate State House Annapolis, Maryland

## Dear Mr. President:

I have today vetoed Senate Bill No. 64 which would permanently eliminate increased motor vehicles license fees as a part of the financing plan of the 12-year road program.

The initial deferment of the increased fees was a carefully studied and fully justified part of the original legislation enacting the program. Subsequently, there have been additional one-year deferments. These temporary stays of an increase in charges, not absolutely necessary, is totally different from complete elimination of increases in

<sup>\*</sup>S. B. 64 was vetoed by the Governor on February 27, 1957. It was passed over his veto by the Senate on February 27, and by the House of Delegates on February 28, 1957, to become Chapter 93 of the Acts of 1957.